Vol. X, No. 38 HUMAN EVENTS September 23, 1953

ARE THE "LIBERALS" LIBERAL?

By E. MERRILL ROOT

OUR CULTURE and our world are today fractured and fissured by a battle for the control of the mind of man.

What is that battle? From the lurid extreme of Communism, militant and ruthless, through the suaver cryptic collectivism of the ADA, and on into the gentlest confused "liberal" idolaters of the State, we have one side. From the sledgehammer blows of Senator McCarthy, through the cool sanity of the late Senator Taft, on into the bewildered flounderings of a public hardly aware yet of what is being done to it yet instinctively angry at its increasing manipulation by One Big Government, we have the other. The fundamental conflict, underlying all subtle nuances of difference on either side, is simply this: It is a battle for the mind of man, waged by those who believe in the domination of the people by the State, and those who believe in the control of the State by the people.

The issue is illuminated by one of the most remarkable documents of the times. Joseph S. Clark, Jr., mayor of the city of Philadelphia, writing in the *Atlantic Monthly* for July, 1953 ("Can the Liberals Rally?"), gives us the clearest, bravest statement yet penned as to what the "liberals" mean. We radical conservatives owe him a debt of thanks and a wreath of respect: he says in his own clear firm words what we have tried to say more fumblingly. He strips away the masquerade of tuxedo and starched white shirt, and shows the naked giant of collectivism *as he is* — muscles bulging, brass knuckles on his hands. In doing this, Mayor Clark contradicts his fellow "liberals" who claim that American colleges are so dominated by reaction that they are full of "mutes and neuters". He admits and even affirms all that I have ever charged about the collectivist conditioning of students in American colleges.

My only criticism of Mayor Clark's candor is that he does not use the final words which would let the "liberal" cat out of the hush-hush bag. He does not quite utter the ultimate truth: *"We liberals are Fabian socialists!"*. Yet he does clearly suggest that Fabius is now in the saddle, prepared to ride mankind (and President Eisenhower) with whip and spur.

What does Mayor Clark say? "To lay the ghost at the outset and to dismiss semantics, a liberal is here defined as one who believes in utilizing the full force of government

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the advancement of social, political and economic justice at the municipal, state, national and international levels. This concept is an extension of Webster's dictionary definition of a liberal as 'A member of a party claiming to advocate progress or reform; not conservative.' A liberal believes that government is the proper tool to use in the development of a society which attempts to carry Christian principles of conduct into practical effect."

Again he says: "There is a vast potential reservoir of political leadership coming from the schools and universities. . . . Moreover it is a potential leadership psychologically prepared to enlist under the liberal banner. Big business has not yet taken over American education. Adlai Stevenson has more supporters among the schoolteachers and college professors than Tom Dewey. . . . It is significant that what used to be called 'history' is now 'social studies'. *Spiritually and economically youth is conditioned to respond to a liberal program of orderly policing of our society by government* (italics mine), subject to the popular will." (Hitler's and Stalin's "policing" was "orderly", and they claimed always the mandate of the "popular will".) Thus, thanks to Mayor Clark's brave realism, the "liberal" creed is made as flat and final as the showdown in poker.

WHAT, ACCORDING TO this outstanding "liberal", must characterize the "liberal"? The "liberal" must desert the American Revolution, which was fought in order to give ever richer *opportunity to all;* he must follow, rather, the reactionary paternalism of a Bismarck, who sought a coercive State dedicated to an at best meager *security for all.* The "liberal" (we are told) sees only *one way* of securing "social justice", "progress and reform" and "security" — through the "orderly policing" by government, on all levels from Washington to the courthouse in Gopher Prairie. We are to make government our indubitable master in order to be assured of the dubious "security" of slaves. We are to render our souls to Caesar, so that Caesar may assure us of bread and circuses.

According to Mayor Clark, this — and this alone — is "liberal". All who think that the ends here projected are meager, or that the means here upheld are dangerous, are not "liberal". That is what he says, and I believe that he means exactly what he says.

Incidentally, he claims as fellow "liberals" Jefferson, Theodore Roosevelt and Lincoln; he lumps them — they are not here to protest, God rest their souls! — with Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. On the other hand, he denies that the late Senator Taft was a "liberal" — or even a liberal.

Thus the issue is clearly drawn by Mayor Clark's refreshing candor, and the conflict is firmly stated. Let us see the fallacy of what he says and the danger of what he desires.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First, it is simply false that only "liberals" advocate progress or desire reform. Radical conservatives (who represent the timeless spirit of America) are *dedicated* to "progress and reform". The great radical conservatives of America include Thoreau and Emerson and Whitman. Thoreau renounced the State and carried individualism to its bravest extreme. Emerson based his philosophy on "self reliance". Whitman renounced "institutions" to bind America together by "the dear love of comrades". And the basic idea of America — the motivation of its free enterprise system — is this: that the dynamics of individual men (the engine) should be set free, except temporarily on dangerous curves, from the statics of the State (the brake on the wheels).

The themesong of the most extreme and characteristic collectivists proves that their society is not dynamic but static: " 'Tis the *final* conflict'." No radical conservative envisages a society (this side Judgment Day!) where a "final conflict" is possible — or desirable. To him life is an endless drama of risk and adventure — a dynamic growth toward infinite aspiration which we forever approach but which we can never exhaust. Goethe is the great modern conservative (as well as one of the most truly liberal minds of all time); and such is his philosophy in *Faust*. It is the collectivist who says to the State: "Stay, thou art so fair!"; it is the radical conservative who forever sees, beyond the shabby years, the alabaster cities gleam.

It is also false that, to be liberal, we must see *government* as the sole agent of advance. Has not the initiative and genius of one man — George Washington Carver — done at least as much for the "progress and reform" of the South as the government's ballyhooed TVA? Do we disbelieve in "progress and reform" simply because we trust the spontaneous energies of free men, and distrust Washington?

THE CRUX OF THE peril of Statism is still deeper and still worse. A recent news item reveals what happens when the State is once made into the image of Divus Caesar. The sister of Pandit Nehru recently went to China. She surely cannot be charged with lingering prejudice for capitalism, or with virulent prejudice against collectivism. Yet her sober report is that, in the construction of a single dam, 2,000,000 Chinese men were driven, like the Egyptians to the building of the pyramids, without choice and without pay. The "liberal" may discount this as the price the Chinese must pay for accepting the Communist version of collectivism. But once the State is made an idol, and is praised for its "orderly policing", how can we know that such power will not corrupt, and that such absolute power will not corrupt absolutely?

We radical conservatives predict this sequence: The "liberal" State will see a goal demanded by "social justice". It will then decide that this goal *must* be accomplished,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in order to "abolish poverty", to ensure "progress and reform", and to establish "security". It will, therefore, invoke "orderly policing" and so — of course "beneficently" — coerce the people. It will pay for this out of increased taxes, levied most upon those who will least benefit from the dam. But when the money finally gives out, it will — still, of course, "beneficently" — resort to further "orderly policing". That is why we radical conservatives, agreeing with the Founding Fathers, prefer to protect the people by limiting State power.

In so doing, we, and not the "liberals", are the children of Jefferson. Claim him as they will, Jefferson believed that government, idolized, would "take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition".

As to the late Senator Taft, read his words about the Nuremburg trials: "The trials of the vanquished by the victor cannot be impartial, no matter how it be hedged about with forms of justice . . . . About this whole judgment there is a spirit of vengeance and vengeance is seldom justice . . . . The 11 who have been committed to the gallows have been held guilty because they lost. Under that theory, President Roosevelt could have been executed had the Axis won. . . . The hanging of these 11 will be a blot on the American record which we shall long regret." Which man — whether according to the history of liberalism or to the logic of the word — is more *liberal?* Mayor Clark is narrow and dogmatic; the late Senator is tolerant and humane and free in spirit. Which, then, is the true liberal? Which most truly "carries Christian principles of conduct into practical effect"?

THE GREAT CONTEMPORARY Spaniard, Ortega y Gasset, defines the liberal in a way that reason must accept. He says that liberalism seeks to answer the question: "Regardless of who exercises the public power, *what should its limits be?*" His answer is: "Whether the public power is exercised by an autocrat *or by the people,* it cannot be absolute; the individual *has rights which are over and above any interference by the State.*" By this definition, are the "liberals" — liberal?

Mayor Clark asks, "Can the Liberals Rally?" I ask the deeper question: are there any liberals left to rally? My own belief is that if the "liberals" of Mayor Clark's definition are going to rally and to rule, we had better — in kindness to them and in pity for ourselves — first provide them with seeing-eye dogs.

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. X, No. 38 Wednesday, September 23, 1953 Washington, D. C.

SEP 23

A Taft Testament: The late Senator from Ohio, in what was one of his last published pieces, in *Look* magazine (April 21), recommended a Senate investigation of our foreign policy — so as to emphasize for the voters the contrast between the GOP Administration and its Democratic predecessors.

Ever since the Senator's death there has been much unofficial discussion as to what he really had in mind in making such a proposal. For Taft knew and made no secret of his differences with the President on foreign policy. Was this intended to educate the President as well as the country by unbaring some of the sordid facts about Democratic "one world" policy (which found support among many Republicans, too)? We will probably never know.

But, some who were familiar with the Senator's mind believe that the following line of argument might well have occurred to him. At any rate, it offers a practical base from which to proceed. Here it is:

The shape of such an investigation, believe it or not, was projected by none other than Professor Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., "king of the egg-heads" who braintrusted Adlai Stevenson in his campaign last year. The Professor, writing in the *New York Post* on January 4, 1953, said: "The Republicans have a picture of the Democratic Party which they want to inscribe permanently on the pages of history — the picture of a Party which sought to bring about a collectivist revolution in this country, which forced war on a reluctant and peace-loving Japan and which became the willing instrumentality of Soviet Communism." So far in 1953, the Republicans have not fulfilled Schlesinger's prophecy. But if they take Taft's advice, it could happen in 1954. However, it should not be an indictment so much of the Democratic Party as of the "liberals" who controlled the Party's policies.

Schlesinger as a New Dealer probably realizes how the New Dealers, after taking power in 1933, sought to discredit the Republican Party, by asserting the "social guilt" of the GOP for the "boom and bust" of the Twenties and the depression, by presenting an image of the GOP as a "tool of the Economic Royalists", a party of "special privilege", etc.

The committee projected by Senator Taft could correct some of this picture and, what is more important, bring out the true facts of how we have got into the present foreign policy mess, how the revolutionary and conspiratorial design of the "liberals" and Communists charted our course up to Pearl Harbor and all the subsequent "mistakes" on a global scale. The role and identities of the "liberals" — largely unseen and unknown to the public — who guided this disastrous course down to today would of course be revealed. Then the highly publicized quest of "world peace" will appear as the idealistic cover for a less noble objective. This might be described as the maintenance of a perpetual foreign crisis which — protected from effective congressional control — would generate the "spend, tax and elect" program required by the blueprint for socialization of the U.S. and control of the national policy.

The impact on the American public of a televised Congressional exposé of this audacious conspiracy of the past 20 years would undoubtedly be enormous. For one thing, such a show might actually bypass and undermine the left-wing control now exercised over public opinion via the press and radio, might put an end to such disgraceful exploits of this control as the creation of the bugaboo of "McCarthyism". For another, such a probe ought to enable the Administration finally to formulate a foreign policy based on the world situation and an enlightened public evaluation of the past. It need not be

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Republican" or partisan at all — the conservative Democrats might well welcome the elimination of the "liberals" from the political landscape. Only then could the Administration offer a foreign policy acceptable to the country, which obviously doesn't like what it has been getting and wants no "me-too" substitute.

Finally, such an "audit" could probably be best made by the Senate Appropriations Committee under Senator Styles Bridges. For that committee not only has investigative power — it also has the power of the purse.

King's Birthday: Former Governor Sherman Adams, reputed "boss" of the White House, is said to be behind the sprouting movement to make President Eisenhower's birthday a national occasion. Adams, a Republican New Dealer, apparently wants to imitate one of the stunts pulled off by the Palace Guard of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The latter were clever enough to associate Roosevelt's birthday with the drive against infantile paralysis, the "March of Dimes", thereby giving the occasion a humanitarian cover. The disguise, however, was perceived, the whoopla over F.D.R.'s birthday was recognized for what it was — an attempt to create a semi-monarchical aura for the Executive and therefore protection against criticism of the Democratic Party and its leader.

Sherman Adams has as yet produced no such "cover" for Ike as the "March of Dimes". But the purpose is just as clear — to squelch growing criticism of Ike and especially his Palace Guard by elevating him to a semi-monarchical position. This development has not gone unnoticed by many in the GOP who recall similar shenanigans during the Roosevelt regime. They observe that in the history of the republic there was no successful attempt to create a "king's birthday", until F.D.R. Today, they comment that these activities of the new Palace Guard should be dropped, and they prescribe a return to the simple "democratic" attitude towards the Chief Executive which has traditionally marked this republic since its inception.

L'Affaire MacLean: The mysterious disappearance of Mrs. Donald MacLean — wife of a key British diplomat who himself just as mysteriously disappeared over a year ago — has caused much interesting comment here. MacLean and another British diplomat had Communist associations and are believed to have gone behind the Iron Curtain to Russia. But the discussion concerns less the macabre aspects of the case. It concerns — and this indeed is a more common topic — the security record of the British Government in respect to Communist subversive infiltration and Soviet spying on atom bomb secrets.

Two thoughts are prevalent: (1) The story that actually MacLean and his male companion are dead, killed by a western counterintelligence corps, is not credited here. This yarn is believed to be a "plant", to obscure the waning prestige of British hush-hush services. One version of the story is that British "c-c" did away with the two men. (2) British intelligence, as it is known here, has considerably deteriorated under some six years of socialist governments. It was during this period that British secret services missed on the Fuchs and Pontecorvo cases. (Both of these men — and MacLean, too — had to do with the atom bomb secrets.)

These thoughts are not idle recriminations. They are to the point at a time when a great gust of propaganda — obviously from left-wing sources — sweeps the press, with exhortations that we "share" our secrets military and diplomatic with the world, especially the British. The disappearance of Mrs. MacLean (incidentally American-born) will be brought up as an example of the failure of the British to maintain proper security.

Note on Korea: A State Department announcement on September 15 struck some observers here as of poor augury for our conduct of the crucial UN political conference to settle the fate of Korea (slated to be held a month hence). The Department announced that Mr. Arthur H. Dean, New York attorney, would serve as deputy to Secretary Dulles at the conference.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Alfred Kohlberg in his controversy over the Institute of Pacific Relations relates in an affidavit how he protested Communist infiltration of the IPR and pro-Communist policies. Mr. Dean presided over a meeting of the IPR. "He answered my statement", affirmed Kohlberg, "saying that the IPR was lily-white (not red) and he could vouch for it." The infiltration of the IPR and its effect on IPR policies were later exposed at some length by the Senate subcommittee on Internal Security, under Senator McCarran.

Bricker Amendment: The great popular movement to protect our sovereignty from international encroachment took the spotlight at the Republican women's conference in Chicago last week. Out of 1200 delegates from 18 Midwestern and Southern states, more than half signed petitions demanding prompt passage of the Bricker Amendment.

President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles oppose the amendment on the ground that it would restrict their power to direct the foreign policy of the nation, and have favored a so-called compromise amendment, put forward by Senator Knowland. Officials of the GOP at Chicago tried to prevent discussion of the amendment at the women's meeting and asked the petitioners to move their desks and material away from the doors of the meeting hall. But 700 members by that time had signed for the Bricker proposal. The petitioners also distributed literature declaring that the Knowland substitute was unacceptable.

Postmaster General Summerfield and Senator Ferguson at this meeting provided fire-eating "give-the-Democrats-hell" speeches — answers to Stevenson's and Truman's speeches of a few days before. But the Republican women who sought not political oratory but Republican action, left the more lasting impression.

UN vs. US: Partisans of the United Nations suffered a bad case of nerves last week when Senator McCarthy went to New York and staged several interesting scenes as he probed subversion in the international organization. There were additional jitters as it appeared that Senator Jenner's Internal Security Subcommittee would follow McCarthy and look into other cases of Communist infiltration of the UN. Those who today seek to defend the UN realize full well that UN prestige in this country has sunk to a new low and suspect that McCarthy and Jenner, both adversaries of the UN, therefore chose this opportunity to probe more deeply and more cruelly into that organization.

Last week we cited how Governor Lee of Utah had manifested his distrust for the UN and declined to go along with groups seeking to boost it. This week, on September 20, the *New York Times* (one of its defenders) refers in a headline to the "ebbing UN prestige".

Such items indicate how far we have moved since 1944-45 when opposition to the establishment of the UN was virtually an unspeakable sin in any of the 48 states. We recall a conversation we had in 1950 with a professional money raiser for "liberal" causes; he was boasting how, after the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, he had been able to raise about a million dollars by phone calls to help an organization propagandizing for the UN. We doubt that he could repeat this feat today.

On Capitol Hill these days, reports from constituencies in the Middle West suggest that Congressmen returning next January may prove very severe with the UN. Talk of "reform" of the organization by modifying the veto power leaves people cold. The measure that seems to draw more support is the proposed withdrawal of our funds (about 40 per cent of the whole) voted by Congress for support of the UN. Such a move would ensure the collapse of the entire organization, for other nations — it is assumed — would not then care to continue their financial support.

Housing: On Monday of this week, Housing and Home Finance Administrator Albert M. Cole warned the American bankers (at the convention of the American Bankers Association) that they must be more liberal with mortgage money or the government will take "direct action". The threat — whether it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meant that the government would step up its loan program or its public housing program was not clear — followed from the fact that there has been a noticeable decline in the construction of home building during recent months.

Mr. Cole's remarks call to mind a conversation we had with a member of his own administration a short while ago. The aforesaid decline had been the subject of discussion at a department meeting. It was brought out at this discussion that the decline was particularly noticeable in the demand for higher priced homes, costing $16,000 and up. The market for that kind of home had apparently been saturated, but there was evidence that the demand for lower-priced structures is as big as ever. Why were not these cheaper houses being built? The answer is provided by the exigencies of bureaucracy, as follows.

The department, which guarantees mortgage loans made by banks, specifies the kind of construction which it will accept as a basis for considering loan applications. Its specifications are set down in a rather complicated code, which includes a number of items that make for expensive construction. Just how and why these items got into the code is not clear, but the suspicion is strong that the supply and equipment concerns, in cahoots with labor unions, had a hand in getting them in. Some enterprising builders, recognizing the need for low priced homes, have submitted specifications that do not include the expensive accessories; they got no encouragement. The bankers, having become accustomed to government support of mortgage loans, are loathe to make loans on their own to these builders. And so, the demand for low-priced homes goes unsatisfied.

Electoral Reform: HUMAN EVENTS has on a number of occasions plumped for the Mundt-Coudert amendment to reform the electoral college. Now the *Saturday Evening Post,* on September 19, has come out for this amendment in a vigorous and penetrating editorial. The *Post* says:

"A compelling argument against the existing system right now is the fact that it enables the corrupt big-city machines and the masses of purchasable voters on which they depend virtually to decide national elections. The most conspicuous example of this is the state of New York, whose electoral vote in a close election might well depend, as it did in 1948, on the size of the vote cast by the Communist-dominated American Labor Party in New York City. Four New Deal Administrations played this game to a fare-you-well, and it is quite possible that the policy of Red appeasement which operated throughout the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations can be explained by the political necessity of conciliating a relatively small number of left-wing voters in New York City."

Among all the proposed systems to succeed the present one, the *Post* likes that of Senator Mundt and Representative Coudert, by which the electoral vote of each state would be distributed among Congressional districts of the state. "This would mean", remarks the *Post,* "that the vote for President would be geared fairly accurately to the vote for members of Congress and vice versa, as was intended by the Constitution's framers. After all, the members of the electoral college from each state already equal the state's representation in Congress. At present, as J. Harvie Williams, of the American Good Government Society, puts it, "the President has a different constituency from his party in Congress". On the Taft-Hartley Law, for example, the White House (which has to worry about the left-wing vote in the big cities) is likely to be on one side, and Congress on the other. This amendment to the electoral machinery would end that anomaly."

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED